

REMARKS

Claims 84-131 remain in the present application. Claims 84, 96 and 108 are amended herein. Claims 120-131 are added herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments and additions. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic examiner interview was conducted on May 8, 2008 between Examiner Kevin Nguyen and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito. Claim 84 was discussed. With respect to independent Claim 84, it was agreed that Hogle does not appear to teach or suggest the limitations of "a single display device comprising a first display screen a second display screen overlapping said first display screen, wherein said second display screen is partially transparent" as recited in independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 96 and 108. Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 84-85, 90-91, 93-97, 102-103, 105-109, 114-115 and 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,923,307 to Hogle, IV (referred to herein as "Hogle"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-85, 90-91, 93-97, 102-103, 105-109,

114-115 and 117-119 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hogle since Hogle fails to teach or suggest the combination of claimed features, including, for example, “a single display device comprising a first display screen a second display screen overlapping said first display screen, wherein said second display screen is partially transparent” as recited in independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 96 and 108. Since Claims 85, 90-91, 93-95, 97, 102-103, 105-107, 109, 114-115 and 117-119 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 85, 90-91, 93-95, 97, 102-103, 105-107, 109, 114-115 and 117-119 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hogle. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-85, 90-91, 93-97, 102-103, 105-109, 114-115 and 117-119 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 86-89, 92, 98-101, 104, 110-113 and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle in view of United States Patent Number 6,246,407 to Wilks et al. (referred to herein as “Wilks”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 86-89, 92, 98-101, 104, 110-113 and 116 are not rendered obvious by Hogle in view of Wilks since Wilks, either alone or in combination with Hogle also fails to teach or suggest the combination of claimed features, including, for example, “a single display device comprising a first display screen a second display screen overlapping said first display screen, wherein said second display screen is partially transparent” as recited in

independent Claim 84, and similarly recited in independent Claims 96 and 108. Since Claims 86-89, 92, 98-101, 104, 110-113 and 116 recite further limitations to the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 86-89, 92, 98-101, 104, 110-113 and 116 are also not rendered obvious by Hogle in view of Wilks. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 86-89, 92, 98-101, 104, 110-113 and 116 are allowable.

New Claims 120-131

New Claims 120-131 recite similar claim limitations as Claims 84-119. Accordingly, it is believed that the Hogle and/or Wilks fail to teach or suggest the combination of limitations recited in new Claims 120-131 for at least the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 84-119.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 5 / 29 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060